

Technical Evaluation Panel Instructions

The Technical Evaluation Panel shall be provided each offeror's technical proposal, other relevant documents, the Individual Technical Evaluation Document (template) and the Statement of Work. The TE Panel usually consists of three people (to include the TE Panel Chairman). The panel will provide an orderly, impartial, timely, yet comprehensive and discriminating technical evaluation of each prospective offeror's technical proposal.

The Technical Evaluation Panel (TE Panel) Chairperson - The TE Panel Chairperson is responsible for ensuring a complete, fair, and impartial evaluation of all proposals. The Chairman will ensure that he or she and the TE Panel members conduct an in-depth review and evaluation of each proposal against the approved criteria and standards and in accordance with these procedures.

Technical Evaluators (TEs) - Responsible for ensuring a complete, fair, and impartial technical evaluation of all proposals. TEs will conduct an autonomous in-depth review and evaluation of the merits of each proposal against the approved factors / subfactors and standards of the RFQ and the SOW. Prepare written assessments that are consistent with and conclusively support their evaluations. This information may be utilized for debriefing unsuccessful offerors as well as helping the Contracting Officer determine the overall best value.

Process – Each evaluator will complete an Individual Technical Evaluation Document for each offeror's technical submission. Each submission must be rated independently of one another and will be evaluated against the requirements of the SOW. An adjectival rating will be given for each sub factor corresponding to each Category (i.e. Management Approach and Technical Capabilities, Personnel Qualifications, Organizational Experience). The Technical Evaluation Rating Definitions (*See Page 2*) must be followed and sufficient information must be given under the strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies of each evaluation sub factor to substantiate the rating given on the "Individual Technical Evaluation Document - Ratings Summary Page". The Technical Evaluators will either have to contact the provided references to rate each offeror's past performance or provide a rating based upon the past performance questionnaires obtained by the Contracting Officer. Each Technical Evaluator will provide an overall summary (narrative) to justify their ratings given, and this page must be signed and dated. The Technical Evaluation Panel Chairperson may facilitate a consensus meeting with all Technical Evaluators to arrive at an overall team summary decision. The team's consensus opinion "Team Evaluation Summary Consensus for Vendor," detailing the strengths and weaknesses for each offeror's technical submission, shall be documented using the format of the Team Summary Technical Evaluation template. After the individual offeror's consensus evaluations are documented, the Technical Evaluation Panel Chairperson will facilitate the team consensus opinion for the overall technically superior offeror. This overall team evaluation summary consensus will be the justification for the highest technically rated offeror and will be documented in the Team Summary Technical Evaluation. The Overall Team Evaluation Summary Consensus page shall be signed and dated by the chairperson. This technical consensus opinion will be combined with the pricing information to help the Contracting Officer determine the overall best value.

Each evaluation document must be faxed or scanned and emailed to ensure that the signatures for each Technical Evaluator and the Technical Evaluator Panel Chairperson are received and filed in the Contracting Officer's official contract file.

Technical Evaluation Rating Definitions

Ensure the Ratings Match the Strength & Weakness Narrative

Rating	Abbreviation	Risk Level	Definition
Excellent	E	Very Low Risk	The proposal contains no deficiencies or weaknesses. Based on information provided, there is no doubt that the offeror demonstrates an exceptional understanding of the services required to meet or exceed most contract requirements. The highest quality of contract performance is anticipated.
Very Good	VG	Low Risk	The proposal contains no deficiencies and only a few minor weaknesses that do not require discussions. Based on the information provided, there is little doubt that the offeror demonstrates a high quality of understanding of the services required to meet or exceed some contract requirements.
Satisfactory	S	Moderate Risk	The proposal contains no deficiencies and some weaknesses. Based on the information provided, the Offeror demonstrates an understanding of the services required to meet contract requirements.
Poor	P	High Risk	The proposal contains deficiencies and significant weaknesses. Based on information provided, there is doubt that the contractor understands the services required to meet the contract requirements. Requirement/services can be met only with major changes to the proposal.
Unacceptable	U	Unacceptable Risk	Technical proposal has many deficiencies and/or gross omissions; failure to understand much of the scope of work necessary to perform the required tasks; failure to provide a reasonable, logical approach to fulfilling much of the government's requirements; failure to meet many personnel requirements in the solicitation. (When applying this adjective to a proposal as a whole, the technical proposal would have to be so unacceptable in one or more areas that it would have to be completely revised in order to attempt to make it other than unacceptable.)